

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending.

The claims are amended. Pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez Herrero (US Patent No. 7,177,642) in view of Chander (US Patent no. 6,778,828).

The independent claims are 1, 7 and 11.

The Office Action Response to Arguments provides that Sanchez-Herrero discloses multiple handset registration process of the claimed invention in full except for the detail that the registration messages must also include biometric information, for which the Examiner relies upon Chander. However, a difference between Sanchez-Herrero and an embodiment of the present invention lies in that a telephone number is used only as locator of the first wireless terminal equipment, while in Sanchez-Herrero the telephone number is used also as a key for authentication.

The Office Action cites Sanchez-Herrero, col. 10, lines 10-30, col. 11, lines 15-65 and col. 4, lines 50-67 against the claim 1 feature "transferring the subscribed telephone number and said first terminal identification information from among the personal information to an exchange which allows to communicate with the first wireless terminal equipment to request registration of position information permitting call in and call out of said first wireless terminal equipment by said subscribed telephone number." However, the Sanchez-Herrero portion cited by the Office Action states that the registration request REGISTER transmitted by UE (user equipment) contains a telephone number and terminal identification information, which cannot correspond to operation by an authentication server as recited in amended claim 1, namely "registering, in a database of an authentication server, personal information, the personal information linking a subscribed telephone number, first terminal identification information for a first wireless terminal equipment ..., *transferring by the authentication server the subscribed telephone number and said first terminal identification information ... from the authentication server to an exchange which allows communication with the first wireless terminal equipment to request registration ... receiving, by the authentication server, from a second wireless terminal equipment an authentication request ...; and transferring by the authentication server the subscribed telephone number and the changed second terminal identification*

information in the updated personal information from the authentication server to an exchange which allows communication with the second wireless terminal equipment ..."

In Sanchez-Herrero, the HSS (home server) can correspond to the claim 1 "authentication server." In Sanchez-Herrero, from this HSS to the CSCF (call state control function), which can correspond to the claim 1 "exchange," only a response that indicates authenticated or not authenticated is transmitted from the CSCF to the HSS, and the telephone number and the terminal identification information are not transferred from HSS to the CSCF. In Sanchez-Herrero FIG. 5, the HSS does not transfer the telephone number and the terminal identification information to the CSCF. In other words, a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon Sanchez-Herrero and Chander/Teitelbaum cannot be maintained, because Sanchez-Herrero fails to disclose either expressly or implicitly the claimed action of an authentication server, namely the language of amended claim 1 emphasizes "transferring by the authentication server the subscribed telephone number and said first terminal identification information ... from the authentication server to an exchange which allows communication with the first wireless terminal equipment to request registration ... and transferring by the authentication server the subscribed telephone number and the changed second terminal identification information in the updated personal information from the authentication server to an exchange which allows communication with the second wireless terminal equipment ..." In other words, Sanchez-Herrero does not expressly or implicitly disclose a multiple handset registration process according to the language of amended claim 1.

In addition, Chander and Teitelbaum are only relied upon for biometric information and fail to disclose either expressly or implicitly the language of amended claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 7 and 11 are amended to include limitations similar to the discussed limitations of amended claim 1. The other dependent claims 2-6, 8-10 and 12-14, further limiting the independent claims upon which the dependent claims depend, inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: February 24, 2010

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501